

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

BARRY EMMETT, #1383329,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNKNOWN UNKNOWN, et al.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 6:22-cv-392-JDK-KNM

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff Barry Emmett, a Texas Department of Criminal Justice inmate proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for disposition.

On October 5, 2022, Judge Mitchell issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that the Court dismiss this action with prejudice as an *in forma pauperis* proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). Plaintiff received the Report on October 10, 2022 but has not filed objections. *See* Docket No. 5.


This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc),

superseded on other grounds by statute, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Here, Plaintiff did not object in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews the legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 3) as the findings of this Court. It is therefore **ORDERED** that this case is **DISMISSED** with prejudice for purposes of proceeding *in forma pauperis* pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), but without prejudice as to the refiling of his claims without seeking *in forma pauperis* status. Plaintiff may also resume this lawsuit by paying the entire filing fee of \$402 within thirty days after entry of final judgment.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **15th** day of **November, 2022**.


JEREMY D. KERNODLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE